

**KING COUNTY SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**November 18, 2005**

**Unapproved Draft Meeting Notes**

Members in Attendance

Carolyn Armanini  
William Beck  
Bob Beckwith  
Don Freas  
Steve Goldstein  
Jerry Hardebeck  
Joan McGilton  
Max Pope  
Carolyn Prentice  
Ray Schlien  
Judy Stenberg  
Dave Whitley

Others in Attendance

Gemma Alexander  
Teri Barclay  
Joe Casalini  
Jeff Gaisford  
Theresa Jennings  
Tom Karston  
Kevin Kiernan  
Theresa Koppang  
Bill Reed  
Bob Schille  
Relaena Sindelar  
Diane Yates  
Bill Ziegler

Action Items

**Lines 11-12: Approval of October 2005 meeting notes.**

**Lines 185-192: Motion on analysis of long haul transport options.**

**Lines 194-203: Approval of system packages for inclusion in Report Four.**

**Call to Order and Introductions**

SWAC Chair Carolyn Armanini called the meeting to order. SWAC Staff Liaison Diane Yates announced that SWAC members no longer need to go to the front desk for parking validation. The sign-in sheet now has a column for SWAC members to write down the red number from their parking stub. Division staff Gemma Alexander will distribute parking vouchers at the meeting.

Everyone in attendance introduced themselves.

**Approve September Meeting Minutes and Review of Agenda**

**SWAC member Max Pope moved approval of the October meeting minutes.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**SWD Update**

Solid Waste Division Director Theresa Jennings reported that the division has met separately with labor (Locals 117 and 174) and haulers (Allied, Waste Connections and

Waste Management) to update them on the waste export planning process, and ask for feedback. The haulers have submitted a package for analysis. The division now has four packages to analyze: two that were identified by the division, one suggested by the City of Bellevue, and one suggested by the haulers.

The state auditor's annual report has been completed and found that the county is authorized to charge the division rent on Cedar Hills Landfill. The audit found against retroactive rent. Jennings said the division would email the online link to the auditor's report to members.

#### **MSWMAC Update**

SWAC member Joan McGilton reported MSWMAC met on Tuesday with almost the same agenda that SWAC has today. MSWMAC discussed the characteristics matrix and concluded that it was a working tool that will be superseded by Chapter 3 in Milestone Report 4. Since the Regional Policy Committee had required that the matrix be further refined and included as an appendix to Report Four, MSWMAC decided to send a letter to RPC instead asking that it withdraw the requirement.

Hardebeck asked why finalizing or not finalizing the matrix was significant. In response to a question, Jennings said the difference is between being a published document or an unpublished document. Armanini added that if the document is to be approved and adopted, more time must be spent on it than if it is simply a work tool.

Engineering Services Manager Kevin Kiernan said the intent of the matrix was to start the evaluation of public vs. private and brainstorm. It helped the division identify issues and start the conversation but having done so, it has now served its purpose. There is no need to formally finalize it, which would require consensus on each part of the document. Now that the draft chapter on the subject for the report has been written, which does need to be finalized and approved, it is not efficient to spend more time on the matrix.

SWAC Vice Chair Jerry Hardebeck commented on the differences between public and private in siting facilities, particularly in the financial impacts to host cities. Kiernan confirmed that the private sector pays taxes and the public sector allows for mitigation. He said these differences are reflected in the matrix, and will be in the report.

SWAC member Steve Goldstein commented that siting raises an equity issue, since all ratepayers pay for taxes, but only host cities receive mitigation benefits.

### **Sensitivity Analysis**

Jennings introduced the division's new Finance and Rates Analyst, Tom Karston. Karston gave a PowerPoint presentation of the sensitivity analysis requested by MSWMAC. The analysis considered three scenarios: full early export, partial early export and withdrawal (diversion) of some waste from the system. Filling Cedar Hills to capacity before beginning waste export was used as a baseline for cost comparison. Karston said that the analysis assumes an efficiently functioning transfer system.

#### **Full early export:**

The analysis found that exporting all of King County's waste as soon as possible would cost \$107 million (present value) more than the baseline scenario.

#### **Partial early export:**

Exporting approximately 200,000 tons (20%) early would cost \$16 million (present value) more than the baseline scenario. Due to changes in the division's operating environment over the last several years this number is less than was projected in past models, and merits further evaluation.

#### **Withdrawal of some waste from the system:**

Entirely removing approximately 200,000 tons of King County's waste from the system would cost \$103 million (present value) more than the baseline scenario. Kiernan commented it is important to note that in the withdrawal scenario, the withdrawn waste must be managed as part of some other waste system, and probably at a higher cost

because economies of scale are lost. Armanini added that there are probably costs associated with the Interlocal Agreements that were not part of this analysis.

Karston said this analysis, particularly partial early export, raises questions for further study, including:

- What export price would equal current costs?
- At what quantity might partial early export be cost effective?

In response to a question, Jennings said these scenarios were analyzed at the request of MSWMAC. It was a very high level analysis, and the numbers are neither concrete nor very detailed, but the key point is that partial early export is the only one of the three scenarios that merits more detailed analysis.

SWAC member Bill Beck asked about the labor picket he saw at the Renton Transfer Station. Jennings replied that there is a dispute between labor and ReNu, the recycling company that collects the recyclables from the transfer stations. The dispute is before the National Labor Council.

Goldstein commented that recycling is ultimately controlled by the private sector, and the division should consider tipping fee impacts if its assumptions about recycling turn out to be incorrect.

### **Long Haul Options**

Kiernan gave a PowerPoint presentation on the analysis of long haul transport options. Rail, barge and truck alternatives were evaluated. He said that barging requires an eleven day round-trip travel time, which has significant impacts on capital and operating costs and appears to be a fatal flaw. Trucking has very high staffing requirements which significantly impacts operating costs and appears to be a fatal flaw. While there are obstacles to rail as well, particularly local switchyard congestion, rail appears to be the most cost-effective alternative for long hauling. This is supported by the new issue of

Waste Age magazine, which concluded that for systems exporting more than 150,000 tons, the economics favor rail.

SWAC members asked how the system would respond to rail interruptions. Hardebeck said that many contracts put the burden on the rail company with high liquidated damages per day for disruptions. These can be used to pay for trucking as a back-up.

#### **Transfer System Packages Discussion**

Kiernan reported on feedback the division has received so far. He said the division received a suggestion to make Algona self-haul only and Bow Lake commercial only. He said the haulers support separation of self-haul and commercial service in general. Bellevue suggested multiple self-haul stations and a single large commercial station for the Northeast Lake Washington area. Hardebeck has suggested that Northeast Lake Washington is too large an area to be served by a single commercial transfer station.

Kiernan reviewed the packages.

1. Package One is the baseline against which the other packages will be compared. It is consistent with the Comp Plan.
2. Package Two would make Houghton self-haul only. Houghton would need a new roof to remain open as a self-haul only facility.
3. Package Three was suggested by the City of Bellevue. This package would not develop the Eastgate property. Houghton, Factoria and Renton would be self-haul only facilities and one newly sited commercial station would serve all of Northeast Lake Washington.
4. Package Four was suggested by the haulers. It separates commercial from self-haul and attempts to minimize capital investments in new stations.

Armanini commented that under Package Three, given the locations of existing stations, the commercial station would almost have to be in Redmond, which would generate a lot of short-haul traffic, since it is not centrally located.

SWAC member Judy Stenberg commented that she looked at the existing stations last month and feels that traffic issues are more significant at Factoria than at other stations. She said Factoria is surrounded by a number of other uses that generate a lot of traffic.

Kiernan agreed that traffic is a significant issue at Factoria. He said that the division owns the Eastgate property and has a permit for a plan that would not move the entrance and would allow improved onsite queueing. He added that for example, a 500 acre development is planned adjacent to Bow Lake, so traffic is a significant issue at all sites in King County.

Kiernan said the goal of today's discussion is to finalize the packages for analysis. In response to a question, he said SWAC could add a new package today and the division will analyze it. The division is trying to identify all of the options now, but analysis could generate a new package, which is partly why Report Four will not select one package for recommendation.

SWAC member Bill Beck asked whether there was enough self-haul at Renton to support a self-haul only station. Kiernan responded that the converting Renton to a self-haul only station was a stakeholder suggestion. Cities like self-haul as a constituent service.

Hardebeck said Package Four is intended to be a least-cost alternative. With Bow Lake as a commercial only station, Renton would have to be self-haul to maintain that service in the area. The tonnage at Renton is low enough that it might be affordable to export uncompacted waste from that station.

Kiernan said the division has four packages and can accept one more for analysis. The division is looking at relative capital costs and will also look at whether each option meets the level of service criteria that were used to evaluate the existing stations.

In response to a question, Kiernan said the division continues to meet with the haulers. Right now they do not have a lot of free capacity. Although private stations handled up

to 40% of the county's waste in the past, most of that capacity has been reassigned to CDL. New facilities may be developed by the private sector, but decisions on public vs. private will not be made until a decision is made on what facilities will be a part of the waste export system.

In response to another question, Kiernan said the division has defined self-haul and commercial customers by billing class in the past, but is considering moving toward the definition used in the CDL contracts, which separates the customer classes by type of vehicle.

Armanini asked what action the division wanted from SWAC on these items today.

Kiernan replied that the division wants to know if SWAC concurs that the four packages presented are the correct ones to analyze in Report Four, and whether SWAC wants to suggest a fifth option. The division also wants to know if SWAC approves the analysis of the three long haul options described.

**Beck moved that SWAC recommend the division carry truck, rail and barge forward as the options to analyze for waste export.**

Goldstein suggested adding "or some combination thereof" to the motion. SWAC member Joe Casalini said the original motion did not preclude analysis of combinations of the three options.

***The motion passed unanimously.***

**Hardebeck moved that SWAC recommend the division analyze the four packages presented for Report 4.**

SWAC member Bob Beckwith asked if it would be possible to trade the Eastgate property for another site to avoid the traffic impacts at Eastgate. Armanini commented that any other use of the Eastgate property is likely to generate much greater traffic issues

201 than a transfer station would. Jennings said that the division would consider any property  
202 options that would help the division meet system needs.

203  
204 ***The motion passed unanimously.***

205  
206 Kiernan said the division welcomes any input on what kind of analysis should be done on  
207 the four packages.

208  
209 Armanini said SWAC and MSWMAC are both advisory and the division is the final  
210 arbiter, and asked what happens when one committee proposes a change after another  
211 committee has approved something.

212  
213 Kiernan replied that it depends. He said that if, for example, SWAC had proposed  
214 Package Five today, after MSWMAC has approved four packages, the division would  
215 analyze Package Five. If SWAC had proposed to eliminate one of the four packages, the  
216 division would make a note of it, but would continue to analyze all four packages  
217 approved by MSWMAC.

218  
219 Jennings added the division is trying to incorporate everyone's input, so it is taking the  
220 most inclusive approach possible.

221  
222 Kiernan said the order in which the committees view materials is simply a matter of  
223 scheduling the meetings. Lead Planner Theresa Koppang added that everyone will  
224 receive the draft report by email at the same time. However, it will be later than the date  
225 printed in the schedule hand out.

226  
227 In response to a question, Kiernan said the division may not make recommendations on  
228 all issues in the final report. For example, long haul service will not be procured until a  
229 much later date. It may be preferable to make the final decision based on a procurement  
230 process at the time of export.



232 **Open Forum**

233 Armanini said SWAC doesn't usually meet in December, but needs to discuss the draft  
234 report. The meeting could be long or short, depending on how much time discussion of  
235 the report takes, and whether members would like to add to the agenda. No additions  
236 were suggested.

237  
238 Beck said Group Health is working to have drop boxes available for pharmaceutical  
239 waste by January.

240  
241 Hardebeck said that a lot of material in the waste stream is recyclable, and can be  
242 reclaimed from dry commercial waste (such as that generated by Home Depot or  
243 industrial parks) at certain types of recycling facilities. Now is the time to consider  
244 whether those facilities should be part of the system, or whether materials bans should be  
245 used instead.

246  
247 **Adjournment**

248 The meeting was adjourned at 11:45.

249  
250 Submitted by:

251 Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff